

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,808		07/15/2003	Jon Godston	CS20558RL	7666
20280	7590	05/30/2006		EXAMINER	
MOTORC			NGUYEN, SIMON		
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45 ROOM AS437				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343			2618	
				DATE MAILED: 05/30/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary	10/619,808	GODSTON ET AL.			
omoo nodom oummary	Examiner	Art Unit			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	SIMON D. NGUYEN	2618			
Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim 11 apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from 12 cause the application to become ABANDONEI	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 Ma 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowant closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. ace except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access Applicant may not request that any objection to the off Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the off that are considered to by the Examiner of the specific sheet and the correction of the off that are considered to by the Examiner of the specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to by the Examiner of the specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to by the Examiner of the specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to be specification in the specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to be specification in the specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to be specification in the specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to be specification in the specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to be specification in the specific sheet are considered to be specification in the specific sheet are considered to be specificated to be specification in the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific sheet are considered to specific sheet and the specific	epted or b) objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate atent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2618

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. The terms "relatively" and "substantially" in claims 1, 15 and 22 are relative terms which render the claims indefinite. The terms "relatively" and "substantially" are not defined by the claims, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention.

Double Patenting

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Application/Control Number: 10/619,808

Art Unit: 2618

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

4. Claims 1-39 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-23 of copending Application No. 10/331,294. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims in the application are broader than the claims in the copending application. In particular, the copending application has a mechanical stop which limits rotational movement.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented (the conflicting claims have been allowed and will be issued a patent according to eDAN).

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Simon Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-7894. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM to 4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward F. Urban, can be reached on (571) 272-7899.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Application/Control Number: 10/619,808

Art Unit: 2618

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

600 Dulany, Alexandria, VA 22314

Or faxed to:

(571) 273-8300 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Hand-delivered response should be brought to Customer Service Window located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany, Alexandria, VA, 22314.

Simon Nguyen

May 23, 2006

SIMON NOUTEN